

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/391,966	09/08/1999	RICHARD J. DITZIK		9391
27058 7:	590 11/20/2001			
RICHARD J. DITZIK			EXAMINER	
307 SURREY DRIVE SAN DIEGO, CA 91902		URBAN, EDWARD F		
,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	1
		•	DATE MAILED: 11/20/2001	, ,

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 09/391,966

Applicant(s)

Ditzik

## **Advisory Action**

Examiner
Edward F. Urban

Art Unit **2683** 



The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED Oct 15, 2001 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid the abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.
THE PERIOD FOR REPLY [check only a) or b)]
a) X The period for reply expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 706.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. X The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) It they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter. (See NOTE below);
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) $\square$ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: the added feature in claim 14 and the added claims 49-53 raise new issues that would require further consideration and search.
4. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
5. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ exhibit,
7. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. 🛛 For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
Claim(s) allowed:
Claim(s) objected to:
Claim(s) rejected: <u>14, 23, 24, 31, and 40-43</u>
9. The proposed drawing correction filed on a) has b) has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
11. Other:  EDWARD F. URBAN PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 2683

Application/Control Number: 09/391,966

Art Unit: 2683

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues with respect to the restriction requirement that the preambles of claims 14 and

44 are almost exactly the same, step (a) in both claims are very similar and that these claims are

drafted in slightly different ways to protect his invention. However, although the first arguments

may be true, both claim 14 and 44 recite details of techniques far different from each other.

Specifically, claim 14 claims a handset unit and the specific operation of the unit, namely the

simultaneous operation of multiple functions, while claim 44 recite a specific technique for

controlling wireless communication by formatting data to wireless communication protocols

necessary for short distance. Therefore, it is still considered that such claims are patentably

distinct from each other.

As to the 103 rejection, applicant argues that Siitonen nor Stein discloses (1) "wireless

communication to local communications base unit", (2) said modes includes wireless voice,

wireless data, and conventional computing" or "run these modes roughly simultaneously". As to

(1), it is still considered that the base station that is in communication with the PDA of Siitonen et

al. is, to some extent, local. As to (2), applicant is directed to col. 1, lines 16-20 which recited

that PDA's are commonly include conventional computing "modes" as described as being "palm

top computers". As to (3), it is still considered that such a technique would have been obvious as

described in the previous office action on pages 3-4.

Page 2